

CHANDLER, DAVID

STATE OF LOUISIANA
PARISH OF ORLEANS

BEFORE ME, the undersigned authority, personally
came and appeared:

DAVID CHANDLER

who, after being first duly sworn, declared that:

I have been employed by Life Magazine for the past
three years as Representative Reporter in the New Orleans
area, among other locations.

My interest in the late David W. Ferrie began in mid-
November 1966 with the information that Ferrie was definitely
linked to organized crime figures such as Carlos Marcello. In
my conversations with Jim Garrison in early December, 1966 I
was surprised to learn he, too, was concentrating on Ferrie
vis a vis the assassination. I was further surprised to find
him ignoring Ferrie's organized crime associations and exclusively
concerning himself with Ferrie's much less obvious anti-Castro
associations. Several times in December and January, I tact-
fully attempted to steer Garrison into at least considering
organized crime's possible involvement with the assassination.
I was unsuccessful. On the evening of January 24, 1967, I
pressed harder with the ploy detailed below, written at that
time as a memo to myself.

In the January 26 interview by Ward, I did not enter
into any extensive, or I should say candid, dialogue with him
because I wasn't confident of my legal rights and know from
personal knowledge that both Garrison and Ward's offices are
wired for surreptitious tape recordings and feared any candid

* To speak of "Ferrie's or-
ganized crime associations" is to em-
ploy a half-truth to paint an untrue
picture. This was one of the first things
I said into the tape and we were
satisfied that this simply was not the subject
area. I would hardly have confided this, had
I not done so, to Chandler. J.C.

dialogue would be used against me. I decided to wait first for some legal advice and, second, to talk to Ward in a public and unwired place.

That juncture occurred two days prior to the States-Item's first break on the story (approximately Feb. 17) in the anteroom of the District Attorney's office complex and in the presence of S-I reporter Rosemary James. I told Ward then I had been advised that his use of the Grand Jury subpoena to question me was an abuse of Grand Jury powers. I told him that if I ever again heard of such misuse of the Grand Jury subpoena by him or his office I would endeavor to bring the whole record of grand jury subpoenas before the empaneling Judge (Shea) with attendant publicity. To my knowledge it was after that conversation that the DA's office shifted from using Grand Jury subpoenas for their interrogations to a law empowering DA's subpoenas which had become effective January 1, 1967.

At the time the above mentioned memo was written, it was my opinion the DA's office was attempting to intimidate me from asking questions embarrassing to Jim Garrison. That opinion remains at this writing.

On the evening of January 24, Max Gonzales and Detective Louis Ivon of the District Attorney's office came to meet Pelham and myself in the Richelieu Hotel. Mostly, Pelham talked to Gonzales and I talked to Ivon. Ivon gave me a copy of the November 25 report on the raid on Ferrie's apartment. I studied it and asked Ivon if he had heard of any passports being found in the apartment. I told him I had heard this information a couple of years ago from Sgt. Raymond Comstock, who

led the 1963 raid and who resigned from the DA's office some two years ago to rejoin the Police Intelligence Unit after a personality clash with Garrison and Pershing Gervais. Ivon said this was news to him and was very interested. I asked him why the original case against Ferrie was dropped. He said he didn't know. I asked if it was possible Pershing had been bribed. He was noncommittal but again interested. At this point Gonzales joined the conversation and I told him we were discussing the bribe possibility. The matter was then dropped and we went on to other things.

On the night of January 25, I returned to my apartment and found the subpoena (attached). I subsequently phoned Garrison who said he couldn't discuss the matter before I appeared but expected to talk to me immediately afterward.

At 8:45 A.M. I talked briefly to my attorney, N.O. Sheriff Louis Heyd, who like myself was completely puzzled as to why I was being called before the Grand Jury. He said conflict of interest prevented him from representing me, and advised that I invoke the 5th on all sensitive questions. I then went to the Grand Jury Room and was told by Al Oser he didn't know why I'd been called but that I was to see Charles Ward, Garrison's top assistant. I did so and after a 45 minute wait was admitted.

Ward called in a stenographer, first name Lorraine, then told me that all accusations of bribery occurring in the DA's office were being turned over to the Grand Jury for investigation. He said this case would be brought before the jury and with his power of notary was swearing me in. (The implication was that he was acting in behalf of the Grand Jury,

although he didn't say this specifically). I took the oath and after the usual identification preliminaries questioned me closely about a December, 1962, repeat, December, 1962 extortion charge against Ferrie subsequently dropped. He questioned closely about my informants. I declined to answer all questions pertaining to my informants, my belief in a bribery, my knowledge of a bribery. I told him I had asked Ivon and Gonzales if it was possible a bribery had occurred. He attempted to weave this into the questioning as my "hypothesis" that a bribery did occur. He was unsuccessful and the stenographer was dismissed. He said I was an unethical journalist for asking such "poisonous" questions and said he was "officially" advising me to get counsel because I would be brought before the Grand Jury. He said I could be liable to perjury. I asked him if he would like my opinion of his ethics and he said no. Ivon was present during part of the questioning and we left Ward's office together. Ivon was distressed about the whole thing and reassured me that it was not him that had told Garrison or Ward. He implied it was Gonzales and said he was brought into Garrison and asked if the conversation occurred and replied yes.

Immediately afterward, I talked to my attorney Heyd again. He was amazed at what he called the abuse of the Grand Jury powers (I gave him no particulars, just said I was questioned about a possible bribery). He said Ward's action was completely illegal and amounted to a "bullshit" coercion. He recommended a lawyer named Monk Zelden who he thinks will be effective if the matter comes up again.

It seems to me that Garrison and Ward had two motives. The first, to find out for their private use my informants and any bribery knowledge. Two, to intimidate me from asking further indiscreet questions.

When I went in to see Ward, he rationalized that the office now has a policy whereby all bribery accusations are brought before the Grand Jury. Therefore, he was questioning me. I subsequently learned he was not acting legally in behalf of the Grand Jury. Any information he gained from me would not have to go before the Grand Jury. He could keep it for his own and act as he saw fit. If he was truly interested in making it an official inquiry, why not bring it before the Grand Jury itself? The only answers I can get are the ones in the first paragraph.

It is my belief, based upon all of the facts recited above and my impression, based upon the entire history as outlined above, that the Grand Jury subpoena has been used as a retaliatory measure against me and that a pattern of such use by the District Attorney creates an atmosphere of intimidation among the members of the news media in this community.

David Chandler

DAVID CHANDLER

Sworn to and subscribed before me

this 16 day of aug, 1967

William E. Bruner

NOTARY PUBLIC

INTERROGATION OF DAVID CHANDLER BY CHIEF ASSISTANT DISTRICT
ATTORNEY CHARLES R. WARD ON THURSDAY, JANUARY 27, 1967 FROM
APPROXIMATELY 9:20 a.m. TO 9:40 a.m.

WARD: You were subpoenaed because we are aware of an allegation of a bribe in this office. The purpose of the questioning is to determine what you know about the allegation of a bribe relative to the case of David Ferrie. Whenever we uncover or hear of a rumor in which allegations such as this are involved, we are preparing a case for presentation to the Grand Jury. We are preparing a case now like we prepare any other case because we consider it a serious matter when anybody in our office is questioned of their integrity. The testimony is going to be recorded in lieu of the Grand Jury subpoena. I am sure you are aware of the consequences of any answers or testimony after I give you the oath. This is a result possibly of remarks which you have passed on to us in the past but other persons have also.

Do you swear that you will testify truly and truthfully as to the testimony you are about to give in the matter of the _____ in the case of David W. Ferrie?

CHANDLER: I swear.

WARD: You are under oath.

INTERROGATION OF DAVID CHANDLER BY CHIEF ASSISTANT DISTRICT
ATTORNEY CHARLES R. WARD ON THURSDAY, JANUARY 27, 1967 FROM
APPROXIMATELY 9:20 a.m. TO 9:40 a.m.

WARD: State your name.

CHANDLER: David Chandler.

WARD: What is your address?

CHANDLER: 724 Governor Nicholls.

WARD: Occupation?

CHANDLER: Journalist.

WARD: Marital Status?

CHANDLER: Married.

WARD: To whom are you married?

CHANDLER: Patricia Morin Chandler.

WARD: What is your wife's occupation or profession?

CHANDLER: Journalist.

WARD: How long have you been so employed or engaged in
this profession?

CHANDLER: Nine years.

WARD: What was your employment or occupation on
December 28, 1962?

CHANDLER: Journalist.

WARD: Were you employed by any corporation or any particular
person at that time?

CHANDLER: Times-Picayune, Inc.

WARD: Where were you residing then?

CHANDLER: To the best of my knowledge at 533 Dumaine.

WARD: Do you know one David Ferrie?

CHANDLER: Yes.

WARD: Do you know him personally?

CHANDLER: I have met him - talked to him.

WARD: When?

CHANDLER: December, 1966.

WARD: Where?

CHANDLER: Lakefront Airport.

WARD: Who was present?

CHANDLER: Mr. Lynn Pelham and other persons whose names I can't answer because I don't have my notes with me.

WARD: Prior to that time?

CHANDLER: No.

WARD: Was that your first personal acquaintance with him?

CHANDLER: To the best of my knowledge, yes.

WARD: Are you acquainted with the charge against David Ferrie relative to extortion and intimidation of a witness which charge was in the Criminal District Court?

CHANDLER: No.

WARD: Do you know the alleged victim of the extortion, John Cater, in that case?

CHANDLER: Not to the best of my knowledge.

WARD: Do you know one of the alleged witnesses, Michael Crouchet?

CHANDLER: To the best of my knowledge, no.

WARD: Did you have any knowledge of this case in December, 1962?

CHANDLER: No.

WARD: When did you first acquire knowledge of the case of the State vs. David Ferrie relative to extortion?

CHANDLER: Here and now.

WARD: Are you saying that today is the first time you have had knowledge of the facts in the case of the State vs. David Ferrie in the matter of extortion?

CHANDLER: Yes.

WARD: Are you acquainted with anything to the fact situation concerning David Ferrie wherein he was charged in the Criminal District Court?

CHANDLER: I had heard that he was charged.

WARD: From whom?

CHANDLER: This whole thing comes as a surprise. Without counsel I decline to answer on the grounds that it will tend to incriminate me.

WARD: Did you inform Detective Louis Ivon and Max Gonzales that there was a bribe or there was money given to a former employee or investigator of the District Attorney's office to intervene in this case?

CHANDLER: Did I inform them of this? No.

WARD: What did you say?

CHANDLER: To the best of my knowledge I asked them if this was possible.

WARD: What caused you to ask this question?

CHANDLER: It is a routine question in my line of work.

WARD: Did you ask the question about any other case?

CHANDLER: Ask these two particular gentlemen questions on any other case?

WARD: Why did you select the case of David Ferrie to ask questions?

CHANDLER: Because it was the case I was interested in at that moment.

WARD: Did you have any prior information about the charge that would cause you to ask about this case?

CHANDLER: I decline to answer on the grounds that it would tend to incriminate me. I have no counsel to advise me.

WARD: When did you first learn of the facts which led you to ask this question?

CHANDLER: I decline to answer on the grounds that it would tend to incriminate me.

WARD: To whom did you first communicate this information?

CHANDLER: I decline to answer on the grounds that it would tend to incriminate me.

WARD: Why did you wait to disclose this information if you had it in the past?

CHANDLER: I decline to answer on the grounds that it would tend to incriminate me.

WARD: Are you aware that the victim and the witness in this case both declined to testify for the State referring to the case of extortion of David Ferrie?

CHANDLER: The victim and

WARD: The witness.

CHANDLER: No, I am not aware of that.

WARD: Are you aware that the victim, John Cater, and the witness, Michael Crouchet, declined to testify for the State when the case was set for trial?

CHANDLER: I am not aware of that.

WARD: Are you also aware that Reverend John H. Mullahy of the Society of Jesus intervened for David Ferrie and requested a new investigation in light of the sworn statements of the victim and witness, John Cater and Michael Crouchet?

CHANDLER: I am not aware of that, no.

WARD: Are you aware that Michael Crouchet and John Cater, although subpoenaed to testify refused to do so on the date the case was called for trial?

CHANDLER: I am not aware of that.

WARD: Do you have any information that would indicate that either Michael Crouchet or John Cater received anything of value in order not to talk - to induce them not to testify?

CHANDLER: I decline to answer on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate me.

WARD: Do you have any information that Reverend John H. Mullahy received anything of value to induce him to intervene for the defendant David Ferrie.

CHANDLER: I decline to answer on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate me.

WARD: Do you have any knowledge of the case which was filed in Jefferson Parish in which Michael Crouchet and John Cater were witnesses?

CHANDLER: On a case filed in Jefferson Parish in which these two were witnesses? No.

WARD: Are you aware that David Ferrie was charged with obscenity in Jefferson Parish and that Michael Crouchet and John Cater were alleged witnesses in this case?

CHANDLER: Of the case in toto, no, I am not aware.

WARD: Do you have any knowledge of the disposition of the Jefferson Parish case?

CHANDLER: I have none.

WARD: Are you aware of the date the Jefferson Parish case was dismissed?

CHANDLER: I am not.

WARD: Why would anyone offer a bribe to dismiss a case relative to extortion of a witness in a case where the primary case with the witness to testify has been dismissed.

CHANDLER: I decline to answer on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate me.

WARD: Why would anyone offer a bribe for any intercession in a case where the two witnesses to the alleged criminal act have declined to testify for the State?

CHANDLER: I decline to answer on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate me.

WARD: Do you know of any rational reason or explanation that would induce someone to give money to anyone to dismiss an untriable case?

CHANDLER: Speaking from the realm of speculation or from my own knowledge?

WARD: Your own knowledge.

CHANDLER: I decline to answer on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate me.

WARD: Since the case is untriable when the witnesses decline to testify for the State, why should anyone who is sane give money to anyone in the District Attorney's office to intercede? In the realm of speculation.

CHANDLER: In the realm of speculation it is possible that the person offering the bribe may be unaware that the District Attorney's office has made a decision not to try the case. This is one possibility.

WARD: Are you aware that G. Wray Gill represented David Ferrie in the alleged case of extortion?

CHANDLER: I am not aware of the alleged case of extortion. I am aware that G. Wray Gill represented David Ferrie.

WARD: Are you aware that two witnesses for the prosecution, Michael Crouchet and John Cater, and the Reverend John H. Mullahy communicated to Wray Gill, Ferrie's attorney, that they did not desire to testify for the prosecution prior to the trial of the case?

CHANDLER: I am not.

WARD: Are you aware that Wray Gill communicated this to David Ferrie?

CHANDLER: I am not aware of that.

WARD: Do you have any explanation, within the realm of speculation, why, when the attorney for the defendant knew that the State's witnesses would not testify, the defendant would offer a bribe to anyone in the District Attorney's office?

CHANDLER: In the realm of speculation it is possible that the defendant is unaware that the case is in this situation.

WARD: Then your whole hypothesis would be based on the lack of communication or lack of knowledge of David Ferrie, the defendant, in the action taken by his attorney and the witnesses?

CHANDLER: My hypothesis on what?

WARD: That there was money paid to a former employee of the District Attorney's office.

CHANDLER: I don't recall that. I said this was my hypothesis.

WARD: Have you ever alleged or inferred in any manner that a former employee of the District Attorney's office received money to intercede in any case in which David Ferrie was charged in the Criminal District Court?

CHANDLER: I decline to answer.

WARD: Are you saying that you decline to answer on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate you?

CHANDLER: Yes and I have no benefit of counsel.

WARD: Do you realize that you, by your refusal to answer, are saying that you possibly have committed an act which may be a crime and in violation of the laws of the State of Louisiana?

CHANDLER: I don't realize that at all. I am ignorant in the nature of the law and I have no counsel and I decline to answer on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate me.

TESTIMONY WAS CONCLUDED.

SUPPLEMENTAL:

CHANDLER: Is that all?

WARD: Well, you have now executed and completed the Grand Jury subpoena. Why would you ever think that anybody would pay money to any member of the District Attorney's office -- to Gervais -- to dispose of a case which could not be tried?

CHANDLER: It is part of my job -- by nature and training -- that I throw bread on the water and see what comes back to me -- as a feedback.

WARD: I don't object to your technique but what I do object to is when the bread is poisoned, when it is a malicious lie and when it is so devastating. When you do this you are engaging in unethical practices.

CHANDLER: Well, everybody is entitled to his own opinion.

WARD: My opinion of you is that you are an unethical practitioner.

CHANDLER: Is that all?

WARD: We may proceed further with this in the Grand Jury and I now advise you to secure the advice and services of a lawyer to advise you in this matter.

CHANDLER: I will.

INTERROGATION OF DAVID CHANDLER BY CHIEF ASSISTANT DISTRICT ATTORNEY CHARLES R. WARD ON THURSDAY, JANUARY 27, 1967 FROM APPROXIMATELY 9:20 a.m. TO 9:40 a.m.

WARD: State your name.

CHANDLER: David Chandler.

WARD: What is your address?

CHANDLER: 724 Governor Nicholls.

WARD: Occupation?

CHANDLER: Journalist.

WARD: Marital Status?

CHANDLER: Married.

WARD: To whom are you married?

CHANDLER: Patricia Morin Chandler.

WARD: What is your wife's occupation or profession?

CHANDLER: Journalist.

WARD: How long have you been so employed or engaged in this profession?

CHANDLER: Nine years.

WARD: What was your employment or occupation on December 28, 1962?

CHANDLER: Journalist.

WARD: Were you employed by any corporation or any particular person at that time?

CHANDLER: Times-Picayune, Inc.

WARD: Where were you residing then?

CHANDLER: To the best of my knowledge at 533 Dumaine.

WARD: Do you know one David Ferris?

CHANDLER: Yes.

WARD: Do you know him personally?

CHANDLER: I have met him - talked to him.

WARD: When?

CHANDLER: December, 1966.

WARD: Where?

CHANDLER: Lakefront Airport.

WARD: Who was present?

CHANDLER: Mr. Lynn Pelham and other persons whose names I can't answer because I don't have my notes with me.

WARD: Prior to that time?

CHANDLER: No.

WARD: Was that your first personal acquaintance with him?

CHANDLER: To the best of my knowledge, yes.

WARD: Are you acquainted with the charge against David Ferrie relative to extortion and intimidation of a witness which charge was in the Criminal District Court?

CHANDLER: No.

WARD: Do you know the alleged victim of the extortion, John Cater, in that case?

CHANDLER: Not to the best of my knowledge.

WARD: Do you know one of the alleged witnesses, Michael Crouchet?

CHANDLER: To the best of my knowledge, no.

WARD: Did you have any knowledge of this case in December, 1962?

CHANDLER: No.

WARD: When did you first acquire knowledge of the case of the State vs. David Ferrie relative to extortion?

CHANDLER: Here and now.

WARD: Are you saying that today is the first time you have had knowledge of the facts in the case of the State vs. David Ferrie in the matter of extortion?

CHANDLER: Yes.

WARD: Are you acquainted with anything to the fact situation concerning David Ferrie wherein he was charged in the Criminal District Court?

CHANDLER: I had heard that he was charged.

WARD: From whom?

CHANDLER: This whole thing comes as a surprise. Without counsel I decline to answer on the grounds that it will tend to incriminate me.

WARD: Did you inform Detective Louis Ivon and Max Gonzales that there was a bribe or there was money given to a former employee or investigator of the District Attorney's office to intervene in this case?

CHANDLER: Did I inform them of this? No.

WARD: What did you say?

CHANDLER: To the best of my knowledge I asked them if this was possible.

WARD: What caused you to ask this question?

CHANDLER: It is a routine question in my line of work.

WARD: Did you ask the question about any other case?

CHANDLER: Ask these two particular gentlemen questions on any other case?

WARD: Why did you select the case of David Ferric to ask questions?

CHANDLER: Because it was the case I was interested in at that moment.

WARD: Did you have any prior information about the charge that would cause you to ask about this case?

CHANDLER: I decline to answer on the grounds that it would tend to incriminate me. I have no counsel to advise me.

WARD: When did you first learn of the facts which led you to ask this question?

CHANDLER: I decline to answer on the grounds that it would tend to incriminate me.

WARD: To whom did you first communicate this information?

CHANDLER: I decline to answer on the grounds that it would tend to incriminate me.

WARD: Why did you wait to disclose this information if you had it in the past?

CHANDLER: I decline to answer on the grounds that it would tend to incriminate me.

WARD: Are you aware that the victim and the witness in this case both declined to testify for the State referring to the case of extortion of David Ferric?

CHANDLER: The victim and

WARD: The witness.

CHANDLER: No, I am not aware of that.

WARD: Are you aware that the victim, John Cater, and the witness, Michael Crouchet, declined to testify for the State when the case was set for trial?

CHANDLER: I am not aware of that.

WARD: Are you also aware that Reverend John H. Mullahy of the Society of Jesus intervened for David Ferrie and requested a new investigation in light of the sworn statements of the victim and witness, John Cater and Michael Crouchet?

CHANDLER: I am not aware of that, no.

WARD: Are you aware that Michael Crouchet and John Cater, although subpoenaed to testify refused to do so on the date the case was called for trial?

CHANDLER: I am not aware of that.

WARD: Do you have any information that would indicate that either Michael Crouchet or John Cater received anything of value in order not to talk - to induce them not to testify?

CHANDLER: I decline to answer on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate me.

WARD: Do you have any information that Reverend John H. Mullahy received anything of value to induce him to intervene for the defendant David Ferrie.

CHANDLER: I decline to answer on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate me.

WARD: Do you have any knowledge of the case which was filed in Jefferson Parish in which Michael Crouchet and John Cater were witnesses?

CHANDLER: On a case filed in Jefferson Parish in which these two were witnesses? No.

WARD: Are you aware that David Ferrie was charged with obscenity in Jefferson Parish and that Michael Crouchet and John Cater were alleged witnesses in this case?

CHANDLER: Of the case in toto, no, I am not aware.

WARD: Do you have any knowledge of the disposition of the Jefferson Parish case?

CHANDLER: I have none.

WARD: Are you aware of the date the Jefferson Parish case was dismissed?

CHANDLER: I am not.

WARD: Why would anyone offer a bribe to dismiss a case relative to extortion of a witness in a case where the primary case with the witness to testify has been dismissed.

CHANDLER: I decline to answer on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate me.

WARD: Why would anyone offer a bribe for any intercession in a case where the two witnesses to the alleged criminal act have declined to testify for the State?

CHANDLER: I decline to answer on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate me.

WARD: Do you know of any rational reason or explanation that would induce someone to give money to anyone to dismiss an untriable case?

CHANDLER: Speaking from the realm of speculation or from my own knowledge?

WARD: Your own knowledge.

CHANDLER: I decline to answer on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate me.

WARD: Since the case is untriable when the witnesses decline to testify for the State, why should anyone who is sane give money to anyone in the District Attorney's office to intercede? In the realm of speculation.

CHANDLER: In the realm of speculation it is possible that the person offering the bribe may be unaware that the District Attorney's office has made a decision not to try the case. This is one possibility.

WARD: Are you aware that G. Wray Gill represented David Ferrie in the alleged case of extortion?

CHANDLER: I am not aware of the alleged case of extortion. I am aware that G. Wray Gill represented David Ferrie.

WARD: Are you aware that two witnesses for the prosecution, Michael Crouchet and John Cater, and the Reverend John H. Mullahy communicated to Wray Gill, Ferrie's attorney, that they did not desire to testify for the prosecution prior to the trial of the case?

CHANDLER: I am not.

WARD: Are you aware that Wray Gill communicated this to David Ferrie?

CHANDLER: I am not aware of that.

WARD: Do you have any explanation, within the realm of speculation, why, when the attorney for the defendant knew that the State's witnesses would not testify, the defendant would offer a bribe to anyone in the District Attorney's office?

CHANDLER: In the realm of speculation it is possible that the defendant is unaware that the case is in this situation.

WARD: Then your whole hypothesis would be based on the lack of communication or lack of knowledge of David Ferrie, the defendant, in the action taken by his attorney and the witnesses?

CHANDLER: My hypothesis on what?

WARD: That there was money paid to a former employee of the District Attorney's office.

CHANDLER: I don't recall that I said this was my hypothesis.

WARD: Have you ever alleged or inferred in any manner that a former employee of the District Attorney's office received money to intercede in any case in which David Ferrie was charged in the Criminal District Court?

CHANDLER: I decline to answer.

WARD: Are you saying that you decline to answer on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate you?

CHANDLER: Yes and I have no benefit of counsel.

WARD: Do you realize that you, by your refusal to answer, are saying that you possibly have committed an act which may be a crime and in violation of the laws of the State of Louisiana?

CHANDLER: I don't realize that at all. I am ignorant in the nature of the law and I have no counsel and I decline to answer on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate me.

TESTIMONY WAS CONCLUDED.

SUPPLEMENTAL:

CHANDLER: Is that all?

WARD: Well, you have now executed and completed the Grand Jury subpoena. Why would you ever think that anybody would pay money to any member of the District Attorney's office -- to Garvais -- to dispose of a case which could not be tried?

CHANDLER: It is part of my job -- by nature and training -- that I throw bread on the water and see what comes back to me -- as a feedback.

WARD: I don't object to your technique but what I do object to is when the bread is poisoned, when it is a malicious lie and when it is so devastating. When you do this you are engaging in unethical practices.

CHANDLER: Well, everybody is entitled to his own opinion.

WARD: My opinion of you is that you are an unethical practitioner.

CHANDLER: Is that all?

WARD: We may proceed further with this in the Grand Jury and I now advise you to secure the advice and services of a lawyer to advise you in this matter.

CHANDLER: I will.

M E M O R A N D U M

November 10, 1967

TO: JIM GARRISON, District Attorney
FROM: CHARLES R. WARD, Chief Assistant D. A.
RE: DEPOSITION OF DAVID CHANDLER
* * * * *

As you can see from the attached copy of David Chandler's deposition, Chandler has now changed his story. When first he spoke with Louis Ivon he alleged that a bribe was offered to a member of the District Attorney's office to dismiss the suit wherein David Ferrie was charged with extortion. This suit was dismissed by Frank Klein in December, 1962, when it was apparent the victim would not testify.

When it became apparent to Chandler that everyone would realize the allegations were false, he then tried to charge that the bribe was offered to release David Ferrie from arrest and charges when he was arrested in 1963, in connection with the investigation into the assassination of President Kennedy.

CHARLES R. WARD

CRW/leb

From the Desk of
JIM GARRISON

Date July 18, 1968

To Numa Bertel

Numa:

I have spoken with Jim and he wants to go ahead with the appeal in this matter. Please expedite the handling of this case.

CRW

TO: Charles E. Ward, Chief Assistant D. A.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FIFTH CIRCUIT

Office of the Clerk

EDWARD W. WADSWORTH
Clerk

July 15, 1968

400 Royal Street
New Orleans, La.

Ms. Louise Kornis
Assistant District Attorney
2700 Tulane Ave.
New Orleans, La.

Re: Jim Garrison, et al vs. David L. Chandler

Dear Sir:

You are hereby notified that upon the expiration of fifteen (15) days from this date, the appeal in the referenced cause will be referred to the Court for dismissal for want of prosecution, unless within that time you remedy your present default under the rules, which default is your failure to pay the docketing fee and withdraw the record for reproduction within the ten (10) day period fixed by Rule 23(a).

Very truly yours,

EDWARD W. WADSWORTH
Clerk

George Baw
By _____
Deputy Clerk

cc: Mr. Cicero C. Sessions

INTERROGATION OF DAVID CHANDLER BY CHIEF ASSISTANT DISTRICT
ATTORNEY CHARLES R. WARD ON THURSDAY, JANUARY 27, 1967 FROM
APPROXIMATELY 9:20 a.m. TO 9:40 a.m.

WARD: You were subpoenaed because we are aware of an allegation of a bribe in this office. The purpose of the questioning is to determine what you know about the allegation of a bribe relative to the case of David Ferrie. Whenever we uncover or hear of a rumor in which allegations such as this are involved, we are preparing a case for presentation to the Grand Jury. We are preparing a case now like we prepare any other case because we consider it a serious matter when anybody in our office is questioned of their integrity. The testimony is going to be recorded in lieu of the Grand Jury subpoena. I am sure you are aware of the consequences of any answers or testimony after I give you the oath. This is a result possibly of remarks which you have passed on to us in the past but other persons have also.

Do you swear that you will testify truly and truthfully as to the testimony you are about to give in the matter of the _____ in the case of David W. Ferrie?

CHANDLER: I swear.

WARD: You are under oath.

INTERROGATION OF DAVID CHANDLER BY CHIEF ASSISTANT DISTRICT ATTORNEY CHARLES R. WARD ON THURSDAY, JANUARY 27, 1967 FROM APPROXIMATELY 9:20 a.m. TO 9:40 a.m.

WARD: State your name.

CHANDLER: David Chandler.

WARD: What is your address?

CHANDLER: 724 Governor Nicholls.

WARD: Occupation?

CHANDLER: Journalist.

WARD: Marital Status?

CHANDLER: Married.

WARD: To whom are you married?

CHANDLER: Patricia Morin Chandler.

WARD: What is your wife's occupation or profession?

CHANDLER: Journalist.

WARD: How long have you been so employed or engaged in this profession?

CHANDLER: Nine years.

WARD: What was your employment or occupation on December 28, 1962?

CHANDLER: Journalist.

WARD: Were you employed by any corporation or any particular person at that time?

CHANDLER: Times-Picayune, Inc.

WARD: Where were you residing then?

CHANDLER: To the best of my knowledge at 533 Dumaine.

WARD: Do you know one David Ferrie?

CHANDLER: Yes.

WARD: Do you know him personally?

CHANDLER: I have met him - talked to him.

WARD: When?

CHANDLER: December, 1966.

-4-

WARD: Where?

CHANDLER: Lakefront Airport.

WARD: Who was present?

CHANDLER: Mr. Lynn Pelham and other persons whose names I can't answer because I don't have my notes with me.

WARD: Prior to that time?

CHANDLER: No.

WARD: Was that your first personal acquaintance with him?

CHANDLER: To the best of my knowledge, yes.

WARD: Are you acquainted with the charge against David Ferrie relative to extortion and intimidation of a witness which charge was in the Criminal District Court?

CHANDLER: No.

WARD: Do you know the alleged victim of the extortion, John Cater, in that case?

CHANDLER: Not to the best of my knowledge.

WARD: Do you know one of the alleged witnesses, Michael Crouchet?

CHANDLER: To the best of my knowledge, no.

WARD: Did you have any knowledge of this case in December, 1962?

CHANDLER: No.

WARD: When did you first acquire knowledge of the case of the State vs. David Ferrie relative to extortion?

CHANDLER: Here and now.

WARD: Are you saying that today is the first time you have had knowledge of the facts in the case of the State vs. David Ferrie in the matter of extortion?

CHANDLER: Yes.

WARD: Are you acquainted with anything to the fact situation concerning David Ferrie wherein he was charged in the Criminal District Court?

CHANDLER: I had heard that he was charged.

WARD: From whom?

CHANDLER: This whole thing comes as a surprise. Without counsel I decline to answer on the grounds that it will tend to incriminate me.

WARD: Did you inform Detective Louis Ivon and Max Gonzales that there was a bribe or there was money given to a former employee or investigator of the District Attorney's office to intervene in this case?

CHANDLER: Did I inform them of this? No.

WARD: What did you say?

CHANDLER: To the best of my knowledge I asked them if this was possible.

WARD: What caused you to ask this question?

CHANDLER: It is a routine question in my line of work.

WARD: Did you ask the question about any other case?

CHANDLER: Ask these two particular gentlemen questions on any other case?

WARD: Why did you select the case of David Ferrie to ask questions?

CHANDLER: Because it was the case I was interested in at that moment.

WARD: Did you have any prior information about the charge that would cause you to ask about this case?

CHANDLER: I decline to answer on the grounds that it would tend to incriminate me. I have no counsel to advise me.

WARD: When did you first learn of the facts which led you to ask this question?

CHANDLER: I decline to answer on the grounds that it would tend to incriminate me.

WARD: To whom did you first communicate this information?

CHANDLER: I decline to answer on the grounds that it would tend to incriminate me.

WARD: Why did you wait to disclose this information if you had it in the past?

CHANDLER: I decline to answer on the grounds that it would tend to incriminate me.

WARD: Are you aware that the victim and the witness in this case both declined to testify for the State referring to the case of extortion of David Ferrie?

CHANDLER: The victim and

WARD: The witness.

CHANDLER: No, I am not aware of that.

WARD: Are you aware that the victim, John Cater, and the witness, Michael Crouchet, declined to testify for the State when the case was set for trial?

CHANDLER: I am not aware of that.

WARD: Are you also aware that Reverend John H. Mullahy of the Society of Jesus intervened for David Ferrie and requested a new investigation in light of the sworn statements of the victim and witness, John Cater and Michael Crouchet?

CHANDLER: I am not aware of that, no.

WARD: Are you aware that Michael Crouchet and John Cater, although subpoenaed to testify refused to do so on the date the case was called for trial?

CHANDLER: I am not aware of that.

WARD: Do you have any information that would indicate that either Michael Crouchet or John Cater received anything of value in order not to talk - to induce them not to testify?

CHANDLER: I decline to answer on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate me.

WARD: Do you have any information that Reverend John H. Mullahy received anything of value to induce him to intervene for the defendant David Ferrie.

CHANDLER: I decline to answer on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate me.

WARD: Do you have any knowledge of the case which was filed in Jefferson Parish in which Michael Crouchet and John Cater were witnesses?

CHANDLER: On a case filed in Jefferson Parish in which these two were witnesses? No.

WARD: Are you aware that David Ferrie was charged with obscenity in Jefferson Parish and that Michael Crouchet and John Cater were alleged witnesses in this case?

CHANDLER: Of the case in toto, no, I am not aware.

WARD: Do you have any knowledge of the disposition of the Jefferson Parish case?

CHANDLER: I have none.

WARD: Are you aware of the date the Jefferson Parish case was dismissed?

CHANDLER: I am not.

WARD: Why would anyone offer a bribe to dismiss a case relative to extortion of a witness in a case where the primary case with the witness to testify has been dismissed.

CHANDLER: I decline to answer on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate me.

WARD: Why would anyone offer a bribe for any intercession in a case where the two witnesses to the alleged criminal act have declined to testify for the State?

CHANDLER: I decline to answer on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate me.

WARD: Do you know of any rational reason or explanation that would induce someone to give money to anyone to dismiss an untriable case?

CHANDLER: Speaking from the realm of speculation or from my own knowledge?

WARD: Your own knowledge.

CHANDLER: I decline to answer on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate me.

WARD: Since the case is untriable when the witnesses decline to testify for the State, why should anyone who is sane give money to anyone in the District Attorney's office to intercede? In the realm of speculation.

CHANDLER: In the realm of speculation it is possible that the person offering the bribe may be unaware that the District Attorney's office has made a decision not to try the case. This is one possibility.

WARD: Are you aware that G. Wray Gill represented David Ferrie in the alleged case of extortion?

CHANDLER: I am not aware of the alleged case of extortion. I am aware that G. Wray Gill represented David Ferrie.

WARD: Are you aware that two witnesses for the prosecution, Michael Crouchet and John Cater, and the Reverend John H. Mullahy communicated to Wray Gill, Ferrie's attorney, that they did not desire to testify for the prosecution prior to the trial of the case?

CHANDLER: I am not.

WARD: Are you aware that Wray Gill communicated this to David Ferrie?

CHANDLER: I am not aware of that.

WARD: Do you have any explanation, within the realm of speculation, why, when the attorney for the defendant knew that the State's witnesses would not testify, the defendant would offer a bribe to anyone in the District Attorney's office?

CHANDLER: In the realm of speculation it is possible that the defendant is unaware that the case is in this situation.

WARD: Then your whole hypothesis would be based on the lack of communication or lack of knowledge of David Ferrie, the defendant, in the action taken by his attorney and the witnesses?

CHANDLER: My hypothesis on what?

WARD: That there was money paid to a former employee of the District Attorney's office.

CHANDLER: I don't recall that I said this was my hypothesis.

WARD: Have you ever alleged or inferred in any manner that a former employee of the District Attorney's office received money to intercede in any case in which David Ferrie was charged in the Criminal District Court?

CHANDLER: I decline to answer.

WARD: Are you saying that you decline to answer on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate you?

CHANDLER: Yes and I have no benefit of counsel.

WARD: Do you realize that you, by your refusal to answer, are saying that you possibly have committed an act which may be a crime and in violation of the laws of the State of Louisiana?

CHANDLER: I don't realize that at all. I am ignorant in the nature of the law and I have no counsel and I decline to answer on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate me.

TESTIMONY WAS CONCLUDED.

SUPPLEMENTAL:

CHANDLER: Is that all?

WARD: Well, you have now executed and completed the Grand Jury subpoena. Why would you ever think that anybody would pay money to any member of the District Attorney's office -- to Gervais -- to dispose of a case which could not be tried?

CHANDLER: It is part of my job -- by nature and training -- that I throw bread on the water and see what comes back to me -- as a feedback.

WARD: I don't object to your technique but what I do object to is when the bread is poisoned, when it is a malicious lie and when it is so devastating. When you do this you are engaging in unethical practices.

CHANDLER: Well, everybody is entitled to his own opinion.

WARD: My opinion of you is that you are an unethical practitioner.

CHANDLER: Is that all?

WARD: We may proceed further with this in the Grand Jury and I now advise you to secure the advice and services of a lawyer to advise you in this matter.

CHANDLER: I will.

INTERROGATION OF DAVID CHANDLER BY CHIEF ASSISTANT DISTRICT
ATTORNEY CHARLES R. WARD ON THURSDAY, JANUARY 27, 1967 FROM
APPROXIMATELY 9:20 a.m. TO 9:40 a.m.

WARD: You were subpoenaed because we are aware of an allegation of a bribe in this office. The purpose of the questioning is to determine what you know about the allegation of a bribe relative to the case of David Ferrie. Whenever we uncover or hear of a rumor in which allegations such as this are involved, we are preparing a case for presentation to the Grand Jury. We are preparing a case now like we prepare any other case because we consider it a serious matter when anybody in our office is questioned of their integrity. The testimony is going to be recorded in lieu of the Grand Jury subpoena. I am sure you are aware of the consequences of any answers or testimony after I give you the oath. This is a result possibly of remarks which you have passed on to us in the past but other persons have also.

Do you swear that you will testify truly and truthfully as to the testimony you are about to give in the matter of the _____ in the case of David W. Ferrie?

CHANDLER: I swear.

WARD: You are under oath.